

## Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

There are grey areas in relation to what may constitute personal data - e.g. an email exchange at work where someone provides a view on an individual, without clearly naming them. E.g. "Employee X is a good worker" - would that be classed as personal information and covered by the DSAR process? We are often asked to search emails across multiple people's email accounts and multiple years - it takes a long time to manually review and determine what is or isn't PII - guidance would be very useful

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

See comment in Q1

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

None evidenced yet - we've not classed any under this category

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Still doesn't address the definition of PII for inclusion in the return, nor does it recognise that the original intention for a DSAR (to enable a data subject to understand and correct information that may be inaccurate) is now being mis-used to try and look for material to claim against or to waste an organisation's time

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

Q9 Are you answering as:

- An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- An individual acting in a professional capacity
- On behalf of an organisation
- Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

Nando's

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ICO Twitter account
- ICO Facebook account
- ICO LinkedIn account
- ICO website
- ICO newsletter
- ICO staff member
- Colleague
- Personal/work Twitter account
- Personal/work Facebook account
- Personal/work LinkedIn account
- Other

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey